

MEETING SUMMARY

CINCINNATI MUNICIPAL AIRPORT-LUNKEN AIRPORT CTAG#7 April 20, 2004

Meeting called by: City of Cincinnati
Facilitator: Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division
Meeting summary prepared by PB Aviation

Attendees:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Michael Burns, Indian Hill | 15. Mike Brenner, DOT&E Aviation Division |
| 2. Andy Radin, Board of Realtors (for John Frank) | 16. David Schlothauer, PB Aviation |
| 3. Erik Nelson, Private Pilots | 17. Ed Cecil, PB Aviation |
| 4. Pat McDevitt | 18. Bart Gover, PB Aviation |
| 5. Mike Lacinak, Mt. Washington Community Council | 19. Albert Peter, Anderson Township Trustee/LAOAB |
| 6. Scot Conover, Columbia Tusculum Community Council | 20. Steve Crow, ATCT |
| 7. Andrew Betts, Sierra Club | 21. Bill Ohl, FAA-CVG |
| 8. Krissi Barr | 22. Debbie Conrad, KCAB-CVG |
| 9. Bill Posey, FBO Rep. | 23. Jim Doepker, CTAG-AC, Fort Thomas |
| 10. Tom Edwards, Flight Depot | 24. Jeff Earlywine, City Manager, Fort Thomas |
| 11. Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E | 25. David Rattenbury, Cincinnati Flight Training, CTAG-AC
(for Dan O'Neil, CTAG) |
| 12. Dan Dickten, Lunken Airport Administrator, DOT&E | 26. Barbara Sliter, Mt. Washington |
| 13. Cheri Rekow, Aviation Division, DOT&E | |
| 14. Bob Vickery, City of Cincinnati, DOT&E | |

Agenda Topic	Presenter	Discussion
Greeting & Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City staff, Consultants CTAG and CTAG/AC members Opening comments 	Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. Enabnit welcomed each of the returning CTAG members and initiated introduction of those in attendance. Ms Enabnit discussed the role of CTAG and CTAG-AC. She affirmed her hopes for consensus and possibly CTAG endorsement, but reminded CTAG members that CTAG will not vote to approve the Master Plan. The LAOAB will make a recommendation to City Council and City Council will vote to approve the Master Plan.
Review of CTAG Meeting #6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening comments 	Cheri Rekow, Senior City Planner, DOT&E, Aviation Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms Rekow provided the group with a verbal and written summary of the last CTAG Meeting #6, held on March 16, 2004, including a brief description of the proposed projects illustrated on Alternatives A, B, and C. Ms Rekow directed members to the responses to public questions and comments, also contained in CTAG Meeting #6, Minutes, noting the answer to question #9: Lengthening the runway does not add operational capacity to the runway.
Master Plan Workshop # 1 and CD Committee Hearing Reviews	Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. Rekow briefed CTAG on the Public Workshop #1 held on March 25, 2004 at the Carnegie Center in Columbia-Tusculum. Exhibits on display included the three alternatives and Part 150 Noise Study's proposed noise mitigation measures. There were approximately 100 attendees. The comments/questions that frequently arose included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desire to maintain Lunken for general corporate and private aviation but not large scheduled passenger service. Appreciation for opportunity to review concept plans. Appeal to enforce "Fly Friendly" procedures (i.e. check haulers and Touch & Go's)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Both Interest in and concern for 24-hour Control Tower proposal ○ Support for Green Spaces (i.e. golf course, trails and farmers' market) ○ Suggestion to measure and mitigate peak noise levels
Mission Goals & Objectives <i>(Held over from March meeting)</i>	Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division	<p>Ms. Rekow reviewed the changes to the LUK Airport Goals & Objectives developed in CTAG#5 and opened up discussion regarding the current draft of Mission/Goals/Objectives. Proposed changes were made based on ensuing discussion as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 3.1 and 7.1 were deemed to be duplicate language and requested to be combined into one objective per CTAG member request • Objective 3.1 changed to replace words "consistent with" to "identified in" the Part 150 Noise Study • Objective 7.4 changed to replace word "goals" with "standards" • Objective 7.5 changed to replace the words "the noise goals" with "those goals"
Airport Layout Preliminary Hybrid (Presentation & discussion)	David Schlothauer, PB Aviation	<p>Mr. Schlothauer opened the preliminary hybrid alternative presentation by discussing each of the options used from alternative A, B and C. The preliminary hybrid alternative includes the follow projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 900' extension of R/W 3R/21L to the SOUTH • Parallel taxiway for 3R/21L • Relocate Taxiway C 1,000' to the NORTH • Relocate Midwest Jet Center • Corporate Reuse of Midwest Jet Center • Relocate P&G to North Airfield Corporate Lease Area • Expansion of Million Air • Expansion of Airport Road SASO Lease Area • Relocate ATCT to Midfield • Removal of Hangar #3 • South Airport Levee relocation • South Airport Office Park <p>Mr. Schlothauer concluded the description of the projects by informing CTAG members that each project would be subject to an environmental review, detailed capital cost estimates and construction feasibility in later steps of the Master Plan Update. The final recommend Lunken Airport Layout Plan will be refined in the airport plans section of the study.</p>
Part 150 Noise Study Projects (Relationship to Master Plan)	David Schlothauer, PB Aviation	<p>Mr. Schlothauer briefed the CTAG members regarding the status of the LUK Part 150 Noise analysis study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part 150 recommendations ongoing • Same forecasts used in Master Plan Update and used for the Part 150 • Several recommendations from Part 150 will be carried over into Master Plan recommendations

		<p>Changes include both Operational and Land Use functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published & distributed fly neighborly program on airfield and to pilots • Adjustment of training flight tracks • Implementation of run up pads (ground run up enclosure) • Airport Overlay Zoning <p>Upcoming Part 150 events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 additional PAC meetings • 1 additional public meeting • 180 day review from FAA • Noise Evaluation Model review by FAA
Next Steps	Cheri Rekow, DOT&E, Aviation Division	<p>Next CTAG Meeting May 18, 2004 H.C. Nutting Ctr. 4:00-6:00pm</p>

Question & Answer Period

CTAG # 7

PB Aviation, April 20, 2004

1. If the critical aircraft (G-550) can operate now on 6,100' of runway, why must a 900' extension be constructed?

Answer: The G-550 can operate now under a restricted maximum takeoff weight (MTOW) at standard day conditions (59 degrees Fahrenheit), however when temperatures rise above 59 degrees, 6,100' of runway will not allow departure at maximum take-off weight. It is reasonable to expect that a critical aircraft based at Lunken Airport will have the ability to use the runway fully loaded on any given day.

2. Why is consideration being given to the establishment of a 100,000 lbs pavement strength rating when the critical aircraft only weighs 96,000 lbs? Why don't we set the pavement strength threshold at 96,000 lbs?

Answer: Consideration for a pavement strength max of 100,000 lbs is based on a wide range of other aircraft, which use the airport but are not based at Lunken. Aircraft weighing more than 100,000 lbs can still operate at Lunken but will require a waiver.

Comment: Information pertaining to the methodology used in a 100,000 lbs max pavement weight bearing rating should be incorporated into the Master Plan Update.

3. Would extending R/W 21R provide any benefit for training aircraft and help reduce the noise to the south of the Airport?

Answer: Removing the displaced threshold from R/W 21R may provide a small benefit to training aircraft, allowing them to turn before reaching the Ohio River. However, removing the displaced threshold requires moving the RSA, RPZ and approach north towards the golf course. If

implemented, the hangar closest to the golf course would have to be relocated outside the RPZ. Furthermore, property extending into the golf course would have to be under control at all times in order to provide a safety area for aircraft approaching and departing from the runway. Given the available 3,800' of runway, no operational justification supports removing the displaced threshold.

Comments:

1. Even with the 900' extension to R/W 3R/21L, aircraft will continue to use reverse thrust to stop. This is a safety assurance to the pilot. As a result, any noise benefits sought in a 900' extension may be unrealistic given the noise generated by reverse thrust. Because the 900' extension theoretically shifts the noise 900' closer to Northern Kentucky, there seems to be a tradeoff, either accepting noise or extending north into the golf course.
2. The "Fly Neighborly" program should be published in the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) directory to inform particularly itinerant pilots

Requests:

CTAG member Tom Edwards would like a copy of the letter from the FAA Runway Safety Action Team (RSAT) stating non-compliance in R/W 7 RSA.

Next Steps		<i>Ms. Rekow announced the second Part 150 Workshop is tentatively scheduled for June 17, 2004 from 6:30 to 8:30pm at Sands Elementary School.</i>
Next CTAG Meeting		The next CTAG meeting will be held at the H.C. Nutting Center on May 18, 2004 from 4 to 6pm.
Meeting Adjourned		